

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 5956  
**APPLICANT NAME:** Watershed Conservation Authority  
**PROJECT TITLE:** San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers Watershed IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 1  
**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$47,685,717  
**COST MATCH:** \$20,008,697  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$67,694,414

**DESCRIPTION:** A Framework IRWM Plan has been prepared and adopted. A Work Plan has been developed describing the necessary steps to complete a final IRWM Plan. The final Plan will be adopted by all Regional Water Management Group members by December 15, 2006. This application consists of ten coordinated IRWM projects, that as a unit, meet all of the statewide priorities, program preferences, and regional objectives, including improving local and regional water supply reliability, water conservation, water use efficiency, removal of invasive plants, water quality improvement, NPS pollution reduction, and groundwater recharge. This application is the result of agencies and organizations working together to ultimately improve the quality of life for the inhabitants of the Region.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

Applicant presents a "framework" IRWMP which consists of a work plan to move from the framework to a full IRWMP, and an MOU among agencies that will cooperate in developing the final IRWMP. The schedule provided shows IRWMP adoption by December 16, 2006.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

Multiple maps show groundwater basins and political boundaries, land use types, and the major water infrastructure. The maps do not show local agency jurisdictional boundaries. Additional water infrastructure features, such as imported water lines and water recycle facilities, are not shown. The IRWMP discusses current water resources, important environmental resources, and social and cultural make up and trends. Water quality issues are treated in great detail, but very little is said about the quantity of water resources in the region. The discussion of water supplies and demand is general. The applicant does not demonstrate the use of a 20-year planning horizon. The discussion of important ecological processes and environmental resources within the region could be improved by providing more detailed information.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The IRWMP presents regional planning objectives and how they were determined. The objectives are draft and subject to further revision. The objectives are derived from six planning documents. Partnerships, collaboration, and stakeholder participation played vital roles in the development of the planning documents. Major water related objectives and conflicts in the region are adequately covered. The planning documents are discussed and reviewed in detail, but were not provided as supporting documents.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The applicant states that the complete range of water management strategies will be considered during development of the final IRWMP. The applicant briefly discusses how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. It is not discussed why some strategies are not proposed. The added benefits of integrating strategies are not adequately discussed. The strategies should include the integration of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan, a primary focus for the Los Angeles RWB.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.** 2

Regional priorities are discussed in the IRWMP, but there is little information on procedures used for project sequencing. The premises for projects sometimes conflict with each other. The applicant did not identify short- or long-term implementation priorities or how decision making will be responsive to regional changes.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

2

A preliminary project list is included in Attachment 6, but not in the IRWMP. A schedule of project implementation is included in Attachment 8, but again not in the IRWMP. Implementation actions are lacking save for the project prioritization discussion. The implementation entity for each proposed project is identified in Attachment 6. Linkages between projects are not identified. Economic and technical feasibility of projects are not demonstrated on a programmatic level.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP is provided as Appendix D to Attachment 3. The IRWMP contains some discussion related to IRWMP criteria and a work plan to complete the final IRWMP by December 2006. Within the IRWMP positive and negative impacts, including those that are regional, are generally identified but are not complete. The submittal does not include the advantages of a regional plan, as opposed to individual local efforts, nor does it address benefits to DACs within the region.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

2

There is currently nothing the IRWMP that qualifies as technical analysis or plan performance measures. However, Appendix D of Attachment 3 does contain a process to document technical adequacy, data gaps, and performance measures as the Final IRWMP is developed. The need for Project 2.5 (NDMA Attenuation Study) is questioned given the impending use of UV disinfection that will reduce NDMA in recycled water.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP does not assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality. As part of development of the final IRWMP, a regional database would be created (Appendix D of Attachment 3) and it would include integration with statewide efforts such as SWAMP and GAMA.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The application describes a process to be used to develop a stable and long-term funding mechanism that will be in the final IRWMP. Funding of O&M would be part of that mechanism. Beneficiaries of the IRWMP and potential funding for implementation are not well explained.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP is not sufficiently developed to include discussions about coordination with local land use planning decision-makers or the dynamics between the IRWMP and local plans. The final IRWMP will use local planning documents as its foundation and the water management strategies and proposed projects will come from existing local plans.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Outreach to stakeholders, including DACs, and opportunities for involvement in IRWMP development have begun and a preliminary list of stakeholders is provided. An expanded outreach process will be developed in the Final IRWMP.

**Question: Funding Match.** This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The proposal contains a summary and specific description of each of the 10 projects. The goals and objectives of the projects will be refined in the final IRWMP. For each project there is a description of its relationship to the IRWMP and other regional documents. Within the project descriptions, are discussions of water bodies, beneficial uses of the water, water quality problems, and some regulatory water quality drivers. Not all projects address compliance with environmental review requirements, particularly with regards to the NPDES/WDR requirements. The proposal generally shows consistency with RWB plans and policies. The scientific basis provided is somewhat general. More discussion is needed on why the implementing agency believes a particular approach will work for each specific situation. The applicant discusses ties to other grant funded projects and provides a discussion of metrics and adaptive management for each project.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The IRWMP contains a list of 33 projects within the region that were submitted to the applicant from local entities and agencies. A project screening tool was used to rank and score the 33 projects and was explained in the IRWMP. The 33 projects are divided into two tiers and the 10 Tier 1 projects comprise the proposal. The Tier 1 projects are not prioritized among themselves and are being submitted as one unit. The reason for selecting the Tier 1 projects is described as a combination of a project screening tool and a consensus approach among the members of the RWMG.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Costs are presented in summary form for the entire proposal, as well as on a project by project basis. Costs require more supporting information to establish reasonableness. Some projects do not have administrative costs presented. Better substantiation for costs is needed.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Timelines are provided for each of the 10 projects, but the timelines for related projects are confusing. For example, Projects 2.5 and 2.10 seem to be sequential. However, the schedule shows the start and end are at about the same time. In addition, the applicant did not demonstrate that related elements of the IRWMP not proposed for funding would be completed on schedule.

### Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

Current water management systems and expected long-term regional needs are generally described. The proposal describes in general how it would augment the regional water supply, water quality, and open space needs. Critical negative impacts from not implementing specific projects are identified. Economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts are only briefly described. The Southeast Water Reliability Project appears to overstate the water quality and recycling benefits, due to the assumption that the source water will be secondary effluent from local treatment plants. These plants are already treating to tertiary standards and already conduct considerable recycling and recharge. The need for nonfiltration in the El Dorado Wetlands project is not demonstrated. Conflicting objectives and conflicting demonstration of need for the UV disinfection project and NDMA attenuation study need to be resolved.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

10

The applicant provides data to show that approximately 40% of the region's population is from DACs. The applicant shows direct benefit to DACs from 4 of the 10 projects, with indirect benefits from another 4 projects. Direct benefits are not quantified, but are typically improvements in usable open space and environmental quality such as improved habitat and cleaner open water bodies. Indirect benefits are typically related to the cost of water supply. Applicant is not requesting a DAC reduction in funding match.

### Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Program preferences at least partially met by the proposal include: integrated projects with multiple benefits, support and improve local and regional water supply reliability, contribute to long-term attainment of water quality standards, reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, and projects that serve DACs. However, there are unresolved issues regarding the need for some of the projects and the amount of benefits they may provide. The groundwater management and recharge projects in the proposal do not meet the groundwater preference criterion.

TOTAL SCORE: 76
-----------------